

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the following amendments and remarks made in response to the Office Action mailed January 11, 2008. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 21 – 22, 24, 26 – 31, 33 – 38, and 40 are pending. In particular, Applicants add claim 41, amend claims 21 – 22, 28, and 35, and cancel claim 23 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants cancel claim 23 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **I. Examiner Interview**

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Patel spent with Applicants' Attorney, Anthony Bonner, during a telephone discussion on February 25, 2008 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Examiner Patel and Mr. Bonner discussed potential arguments and amendments with regard to claim 21, in view of *Shaffer, Ridgley, Scherer, and Baral*. The general thrust of the potential principal arguments included a discussion of at least one embodiment of the present application disclosing "providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages." Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Patel carefully consider this response and the amendments.

## **II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action indicates that claims 21 – 24 and 26 – 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In response to the Office Action’s request, Applicants amend claim 21. Applicants submit that this amendment complies with the Office Action request and that no new matter has been added.

## **III. Double Patenting**

The Office Action indicates that claims 21 – 24 and 26 – 27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of nonstatutory double patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over claims 1 – 5 of U.S. Patent Number 6,650,740 in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,567,507, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042. The Office Action also indicates that claims 28 – 31 and 33 – 34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of nonstatutory double patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over claims 6 – 11 of U.S. Patent Number 6,650,740 in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870, further in view of 6,567,507, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042. Applicants agree to file a terminal disclaimer at the time of allowance.

## **IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

### **A. Claim 21 is Allowable Over *Shaffer* in view of *Ridgley* further in view of *Scherer* and further in view of *Baral***

The Office Action indicates that claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,567,507 (“*Shaffer*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418 (“*Ridgley*”) further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870 (“*Scherer*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042 (“*Baral*”). Applicants

respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Shaffer* in view of *Ridgley* further in view of *Scherer* and further in view of *Baral* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 21. More specifically, claim 21 recites:

A method to make a reply call to a voice mail message, comprising:

receiving a communication request from a voicemail server, the communication request resulting from a subscriber accessing, from an accessing number, a voicemail message created by a caller via the voicemail server, the voicemail message accessed from a plurality of voicemail messages, further resulting from the voicemail server presenting the user with the plurality of voicemail messages, **further resulting from, after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**, and further resulting from the subscriber indicating the voicemail message from the plurality of presented voicemail messages for connecting the subscriber with the caller;

connecting a communication between the subscriber and the caller without utilization of the voicemail server, wherein connecting a communication between the subscriber and the caller includes routing the communication through a directory number associated with the subscriber, such that the communication appears to originate from the directory number associated with the subscriber to facilitate creation of a billing record entry associated with the directory number, the directory number being different than the accessing number;

receiving a dual tone multi frequency (DTMF) signal from the subscriber;

determining whether the received DTMF signal indicates a desire to reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server; and

in response to determining that the received DTMF signal indicates a desire to reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server, reconnecting the subscriber with the voicemail server.

***(emphasis added)***

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, nor *Baral*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “method to make a reply call to a voice mail message, comprising... receiving a communication request from a voicemail server, the communication request resulting from a subscriber accessing, from an accessing number, a voicemail message created by a caller via the voicemail server, the voicemail message accessed from a plurality of voicemail messages, further resulting from the voicemail server presenting the user with the

plurality of voicemail messages, ***further resulting from, after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***, and further resulting from the subscriber indicating the voicemail message from the plurality of presented voicemail messages for connecting the subscriber with the caller" as recited in claim 21, as amended. More specifically, *Shaffer* discloses a "pointer [that] is used to indicate a return position in the message queue" (column 2, line 13). However, *Shaffer* fails to disclose "***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***" as recited in claim 21, as amended.

Additionally, *Ridgley* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*. More specifically, *Ridgley* discloses a "message recipient may then be prompted with a series of menu options, including, for example, an option to playback (or review) messages" (column 6, line 23). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that *Ridgely* fails to disclose anything related to "***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***" as recited in claim 21, as amended.

Additionally, *Scherer* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer* and *Ridgley*. More specifically, *Scherer* discloses "a system for replacing all or a portion of the existing caller identification data... or modifying the caller ID and/or having the modified caller ID act as a reference to data stored elsewhere" (column 7, line 24). However, *Scherer* fails to disclose anything related to "***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***" as recited in claim 21, as amended.

Further, *Baral* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, and *Scherer*. More specifically, *Baral* discloses a "toll switch [that monitors] for a signal representing the customer's request for spontaneous voice message service" (column 2, line 51). However, *Baral* fails to

disclose anything related to “**after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**” as recited in claim 21, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 21, as amended, is allowable over any combination of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral*.

**B. Claim 28 is Allowable Over Shaffer in view of Ridgley further in view of Scherer and further in view of Baral**

The Office Action indicates that claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,567,507 (“*Shaffer*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418 (“*Ridgley*”) further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870 (“*Scherer*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042 (“*Baral*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Shaffer* in view of *Ridgley* further in view of *Scherer* and further in view of *Baral* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 28. More specifically, claim 28 recites:

A system for making a reply call to a voice mail message, comprising:

a receiving component configured to receive a communication request from a voicemail server, the communication request resulting from a subscriber accessing, from an accessing number, a plurality of voicemail messages, at least one of the messages created by a caller via the voicemail server, further resulting from, **after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**, and further resulting from the subscriber sending a command to connect the subscriber with the caller;

a connecting component configured to facilitate a communication between the subscriber and the caller without utilization of the voicemail server, wherein facilitating a communication between the subscriber and the caller includes routing the communication through a directory number associated with the subscriber, such that the communication appears to originate from the directory number associated with the subscriber to facilitate creation of a billing record entry associated with the directory number, the directory number being different than the accessing number; and

a reconnecting component configured to, receive a dual tone multi frequency (DTMF) signal from the subscriber, determine whether the received DTMF signal indicates a desire to reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server, and in response to determining that the received

DTMF signal indicates a desire to reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server, reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server.  
**(emphasis added)**

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Shafer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, nor *Baral*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “system for making a reply call to a voice mail message, comprising... a receiving component configured to receive a communication request from a voicemail server, the communication request resulting from a subscriber accessing, from an accessing number, a plurality of voicemail messages, at least one of the messages created by a caller via the voicemail server, further resulting from, **after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**, and further resulting from the subscriber sending a command to connect the subscriber with the caller” as recited in claim 28, as amended. More specifically, *Shaffer* discloses a “pointer [that] is used to indicate a return position in the message queue” (column 2, line 13). However, *Shaffer* fails to disclose “**after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**”, as recited in claim 28, as amended.

Additionally, *Ridgley* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*. More specifically, *Ridgley* discloses a “message recipient may then be prompted with a series of menu options, including, for example, an option to playback (or review) messages” (column 6, line 23). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that *Ridgely* fails to disclose anything related to “**after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**” as recited in claim 28, as amended.

Additionally, *Scherer* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer* and *Ridgley*. More specifically, *Scherer* discloses “a system for replacing all or a portion of the existing caller identification data... or modifying the caller ID and/or having the modified caller ID act as a

reference to data stored elsewhere" (column 7, line 24). However, *Scherer* fails to disclose anything related to "**after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**" as recited in claim 28, as amended.

Further, *Baral* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, and *Scherer*. More specifically, *Baral* discloses a "toll switch [that monitors] for a signal representing the customer's request for spontaneous voice message service" (column 2, line 51). However, *Baral* fails to disclose anything related to "**after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**" as recited in claim 28, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 28, as amended, is allowable over any combination of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral*.

**C. Claim 35 is Allowable Over Shaffer in view of Ridgley further in view of Scherer and further in view of Baral**

The Office Action indicates that claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,567,507 ("*Shaffer*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418 ("*Ridgley*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870 ("*Scherer*") and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042 ("*Baral*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Shaffer* in view of *Ridgley* further in view of *Scherer* and further in view of *Baral* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 35. More specifically, claim 35 recites:

A computer readable medium configured to facilitate initiation of a reply call to a voice mail message, comprising:  
logic configured to receive a communication request from a voicemail server, the communication request resulting from a subscriber accessing, from an accessing number, a plurality of voicemail messages, at least one of the messages created by a caller via the voicemail server, further resulting from, **after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect**, and further resulting

from the subscriber sending a command to connect the subscriber with the caller;

logic configured to facilitate a communication between the subscriber and the caller without utilization of the voicemail server, wherein connecting a communication between the subscriber and the caller includes routing the communication through a directory number associated with the subscriber, such that the communication appears to originate from the directory number associated with the subscriber to facilitate creation of a billing record entry associated with the directory number, the directory number being different than the accessing number; and

logic configured to receive a dual tone multi frequency (DTMF) signal from the subscriber, determine whether the received DTMF signal indicates a desire to reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server, and in response to determining that the received DTMF signal indicates a desire to reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server, reconnect the subscriber with the voicemail server.

***(emphasis added)***

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 35, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Shafer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, nor *Baral*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a “computer readable medium configured to facilitate initiation of a reply call to a voice mail message, comprising... logic configured to receive a communication request from a voicemail server, the communication request resulting from a subscriber accessing, from an accessing number, a plurality of voicemail messages, at least one of the messages created by a caller via the voicemail server, further resulting from, ***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***, and further resulting from the subscriber sending a command to connect the subscriber with the caller” as recited in claim 35, as amended. More specifically, *Shaffer* discloses a “pointer [that] is used to indicate a return position in the message queue” (column 2, line 13). However, *Shaffer* fails to disclose “***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***” as recited in claim 35, as amended.

Additionally, *Ridgley* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*. More specifically, *Ridgley* discloses a “message recipient may then be prompted with a series of menu options, including, for example, an option to playback (or review) messages” (column 6, line 23). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that *Ridgley* fails to disclose anything related to “***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***” as recited in claim 35, as amended.

Additionally, *Scherer* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer* and *Ridgley*. More specifically, *Scherer* discloses “a system for replacing all or a portion of the existing caller identification data... or modifying the caller ID and/or having the modified caller ID act as a reference to data stored elsewhere” (column 7, line 24). However, *Scherer* fails to disclose anything related to “***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***” as recited in claim 35, as amended.

Further, *Baral* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, and *Scherer*. More specifically, *Baral* discloses a “toll switch [that monitors] for a signal representing the customer's request for spontaneous voice message service” (column 2, line 51). However, *Baral* fails to disclose anything related to “***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect***” as recited in claim 35, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 35, as amended, is allowable over any combination of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral*.

**D. Claims 22, 27, 29 – 30, 34, and 36 – 37 are Allowable Over Shaffer in view of Ridgley further in view of Scherer and further in view of Baral**

The Office Action indicates that claims 22, 27, 29 – 30, 34, and 36 – 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,567,507

(“*Shaffer*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418 (“*Ridgley*”) further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870 (‘*Scherer*’) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042 (“*Baral*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Shaffer* in view of *Ridgley* further in view of *Scherer* and further in view of *Baral* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 22, 27, 29 – 30, 34, and 36 – 37. More specifically, dependent claims 22 and 27 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 28. Dependent claims 29 – 30 and 34 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 28. Further, dependent claims 36 – 37 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 35. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**E. Claims 24, 31, and 38 are Allowable Over Shaffer modified by Ridgley, Scherer and Baral and further in view of Ekstrom**

The Office Action indicates that claims 24, 31, and 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,567,507 (“*Shaffer*”) modified by U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418 (“*Ridgley*”), U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870 (‘*Scherer*’), and U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042 (“*Baral*”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,148,069 (“*Ekstrom*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Shaffer* modified by *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral* and further in view of *Ekstrom* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 24, 31, and 38. More specifically, dependent claim 24 is believed to be allowable over *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral* for at least the reason that this claim depends from and include the elements of allowable independent claim 28. Dependent claim 31 is believed to be allowable over *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral* for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable

independent claim 28. Further, dependent claim 38 is believed to be allowable over *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral* for at least the reason that it depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 35. Because *Ekstrom* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral*, claims 24, 31, and 38 are allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**F. Claims 26, 33, and 40 are Allowable Over Shaffer modified by Ridgley, Scherer and Baral and further in view of Berberich**

The Office Action indicates that claims 24, 31, and 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,567,507 ("*Shaffer*") modified by U.S. Patent Number 6,195,418 ("*Ridgley*"), U.S. Patent Number 6,137,870 ('*Scherer*') and U.S. Patent Number 4,932,042 ("*Baral*") and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,818,919 ("*Berberich*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Shaffer* modified by *Ridgley*, *Scherer* and *Baral* and further in view of *Berberich* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 26, 33, and 40. More specifically, dependent claim 26 is believed to be allowable over *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral* for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 28.

Dependent claim 33 is believed to be allowable over *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral* for at least the reason that this claim depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 28. Further, dependent claim 40 is believed to be allowable over *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral* for at least the reason that it depends from and includes the elements of allowable independent claim 35. Because *Berberich* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Shaffer*, *Ridgley*, *Scherer*, and *Baral*, claims 24, 31, and 38 are allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**V. New Claim 41 is Allowable**

Additionally, Applicants add new claim 41. New claim 41 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 21. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**VI. Allegedly Well Known Subject Matter**

**A. The Subject Matter of Claim 21 is not Well Known**

Additionally, in rejecting claim 21, the Office Action asserts “[t]he use of touchtone i.e. DTMF signals for various commands in telecommunications was well known in the art” (OA page 9, second to last line). Applicants respectfully traverse the alleged finding of well known subject matter and submit that the subject matter noted above should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions, as required. Additionally, Applicants submit that merely providing a reference (or a couple of references) that allegedly discloses the subject matter in question, does not rise to an evidentiary level of being well known in the industry. Applicants submit that even if the cited references disclose the subject matter in question (a point that the Applicants are not conceding), presence of that subject matter in a reference does not raise the level of commonality of that subject matter to something of unquestionable fact. For at least this specific and particular reason, Applicants submit that the subject matter in question is not well known in the art.

Applicants additionally submit that particularly in the context of the claimed combination that includes “***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect,***” the subject matter in question is too complex for a reasonably skilled person to consider it to be

well known to the point that no additional evidence is needed. For at least this additional specific and particular reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter in question is not well known in the art, respectfully traverse the alleged finding of well known subject matter, and submit that claim 21, as amended, is patentable in view of the cited art.

**B. The Subject Matter of Claim 35 is not Well Known**

Additionally, in rejecting claim 21, the Office Action asserts “Shaffer teaches of a system with components that use computers and computer readable mediums as is well known in the art” (OA page 12, second to last line). Applicants respectfully traverse the alleged finding of well known subject matter and submit that the subject matter noted above should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions, as required. Additionally, Applicants submit that merely providing a reference (or a couple of references) that allegedly discloses the subject matter in question, does not rise to an evidentiary level of being well known in the industry. Applicants submit that even if the cited references disclose the subject matter in question (a point that the Applicants are not conceding), presence of that subject matter in a reference does not raise the level of commonality of that subject matter to something of unquestionable fact. For at least this specific and particular reason, Applicants submit that the subject matter in question is not well known in the art.

Applicants additionally submit that particularly in the context of the claimed combination that includes “***after presentation of the plurality of voicemail messages, providing a user prompt for a user to indicate which of the plurality of voicemail messages to connect,***” the subject matter in question is too complex for a reasonably skilled person to consider it to be well known to the point that no additional evidence is needed. For at least this additional specific and particular reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter in question

is not well known in the art, respectfully traverse the alleged finding of well known subject matter, and submit that claim 35, as amended, is patentable in view of the cited art.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

*/afb/*

---

**Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1500  
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500  
Customer No.: **38823**